



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,135	10/20/2001	Bruce N. Ames	B00-001-2	7465

23379 7590 02/26/2004

RICHARD ARON OSMAN  
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY LAW GROUP  
242 AVE VISTA DEL OCEANO  
SAN CLEMENTE, CA 92672

EXAMINER
----------

JONES, DWAYNE C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1614

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/038,135	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AMES ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dwayne C Jones	<b>Art Unit</b> 1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19DEC2003 and 08DEC2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 62-131 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 62-131 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20OCT2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Claims***

1. Claims 62-131 are pending.
2. Claims 62-131 are rejected.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 62-131 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. The information disclosure statement filed October 20, 2001 has been reviewed and considered, see enclosed copy of PTO FORM 1449.
5. The information disclosure statement filed December 8, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 62-131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishna et al. Krishna et al. teach of the protective effects of inter alia hydroxylamines. Krishna et al. teach that cellular damage may result from the cytotoxicity of reactive oxygen species, (see column 1, page 3477). Krishna et al. also teach that the reactive oxygen species are byproducts of normal processes in aerobic environments, and when there are imbalances in these reactive oxygen species oxidative stress results to cells, (see page 3477). Krishna et al. also disclose that hydroxylamines have been shown to protect mammalian cells exposed to reactive oxygen species, such as super oxide, hydrogen peroxide, organic hydroperoxides, and redox cycling and anticancer agents, (see column 2, page 3478). In addition, Krishna et al. teach of screening methods to test the effectiveness of hydroxylamines to provide protection to mammalian cells that are exposed to a reactive oxygen species, namely hydrogen peroxide. The results were performed with an in vitro assay, (see column 2, page 3478). In the assay model of this teaching the efficacy of the antioxidant, such as hydroxylamine, was evaluated by exposing the cells to a reactive oxygen species, namely hydrogen peroxide, and assessing the viability of the cells both in the absence and in the presence of a fixed

Art Unit: 1614

concentration of the test compound, (see column 2, page 3480). The assessment would compare the amounts of the reactive oxygen species present, while the instant invention is comparing the amounts of the antioxidant of the hydroxylamine present after contact with the cells. There are many ways to measure the concentration of an assay, such as a decrease in the concentration of the unwanted species or compound, (as in Krishna et al.) or still by measuring the concentration of the antioxidant compound of the hydroxylamine (as is obviously claimed by applicant).

9. The instant claims differ only in screening methods for primary hydroxylamines whereas the prior art reference of Krishna et al. are directed to screening methods with the utilization of secondary amines. The skilled artisan would most certainly been motivated from the screening methods of Krishna et al. to employ other antioxidant or cytoprotective hydroxylamine compounds to protect cells from the deleterious effects due to oxidative damage due to inter alia, reactive oxygen species. The generation of reactive oxygen species, as taught by Krishna et al., is evident in many various biochemical and aerobic environments. Accordingly, if a cellular event such as from a variety of scenarios, for instance ischemia or inflammation or cancer or cytokines or still other events, which can generate and cause oxidative damage to a cell, would be obviously protected with the presence of hydroxylamine compounds, as clearly taught by Krishna et al. Clearly, it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to utilize other hydroxylamine compounds and derivatives, which would obviously include primary hydroxylamine compounds and their derivatives, because the reaction between the oxidative damage lies between the reactive oxygen species and they hydroxylamine

Art Unit: 1614

moiety. The skilled artisan would additionally be motivated to use primary hydroxylamine compounds and their derivatives especially since the hydroxylamine moiety of a primary hydroxyl amine is less sterically hindered than a primary hydroxylamine compound.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. C. Jones whose telephone number is (571) 272-0578. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursday, and Fridays from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm. The official fax No. for correspondence is (703) 872-9306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel, may be reached at (571) 272-0584.



DWAYNE JONES  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Tech. Ctr. 1614  
February 20, 2004